

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 10, 2002 LB 1309

and I won't even read some of the things that...I think Senator Connealy passed out the flier on some of the things that the Rural Development Commission has done. I think it's like putting seed in the garden. You plant something, expect to get a good return, and I think this is one of the programs that we do get a good return. I think whenever something happens in the smaller communities or even anywhere in the larger cities too there's some leadership that's had a vision and stepped up and tried to get something done, but many times they need someone to come along side to help them in writing grants or finding other people to share in the cost, that they know where to go, and I think they've done a great job in a lot of projects across the state. I also supported LB 775, to retain it in the way it was, because I believe that was a similar situation where we expect to get a return out of it. So I'll just simply quit at that and say that I will support Senator Stuhr's amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Baker.

SENATOR BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I rise to support Senator Stuhr's amendment in principle. I can see right now we're bucking the Appropriations Committee doing this though, and I think what I'm going to suggest is that we support MO283, and that's simply the line in this veto package here that...dealing with the issue and rather than try and amend the package. There's some things in the package that I have a very difficult time supporting when you're talking about Metro Transit and so on, et cetera, and this is one small, small piece of the rural puzzle here, \$347,000, never mind the all the ag...Department of Ag and so on, et cetera. I think I'd rather work on the motion if we can, but that's a gamble I guess we're going to take, isn't it, Senator Stuhr? I don't know how we're going to...how I'm...personally I'm going to approach this. This...certainly the Resource Development Commission is very important to me, very important to me, but whether we can proceed in this manner I don't know. We're still at the crossroads with this whole package that I obviously don't support overriding the veto of this package. So puts me in a difficult position here on...as far as that goes. There is an alternative, is what I'm saying, and it's MO283, so we can go that route. But I fall back on what I said this morning. We